REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. In the current amendment, claims 1, 8-9, 16, 23 and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-30 will be pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 16 are independent. Applicants submit that pending claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance. All stated grounds for rejection have been addressed in the following comments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-30 in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

I. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-13, 16-17, 19-23 and 25-28 Rejected as Unpatentable over Hirata and Bhalla

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-13, 16-17, 19-23 and 25-28 are rejected as unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,041,353 Hirata et al. ("Hirata") and further in view of US Publication No. 2003/0208602 to Bhalla et al. ("Bhalla") under 35 U.S.C. §103. Amended claims 1 and 16 are independent. Claims 2-15 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1 as amended. Claims 17-30 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 16 as amended. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Hirata and Bhalla, alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claimed invention, as amended.

A. Independent Claims 1 and 16 Patentably Distinguished Over Hirata and Bhalla

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Amended claims 1 and 16 are directed to a method and a system, respectively, for providing a uniform network addressing scheme for a user accessing a computer on a network which is independent from the computer the user is accessing. These claims recite assigning a first virtual host name from the plurality of virtual host names to a first user accessing the network via a first computer. The first computer has a computer host name and a computer internet

protocol address to connect to the network. These claims also recite assigning a second virtual host name from the plurality of virtual host names, different from the first virtual host name, to a second user accessing the network via the first computer. The first virtual host name of the first user is used with an internet protocol address assigned to the first user for network communications of the first user communicated via the first computer. The second virtual host name of the second user is used with an internet protocol address assigned to the second user for network communications of the second user communicated via the first computer. Neither Hirata nor Bhalla, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention as amended.

Hirata and Bhalla fail to teach or suggest using the first virtual host name of the first user with an internet protocol address assigned to the first user for network communications of the first user communicated via the first computer, and using the second virtual host name of the second user with an internet protocol address assigned to the second user for network communications of the second user communicated via the first computer. Instead, Hirata discusses using a single internet protocol address and a single host name assigned to a computer for network communications of all users on the computer. Hirata does not distinguish the internet protocol address or host name of one user using the computer for network communications from another user using the same computer for network communications. In addition to Hirata, the Examiner also refers to paragraph [0033] of Bhalla, which discusses assigning the users of a computer a network access identifier. However, Bhalla's network access identifier is not used for network communications nor does the network access identifier equate to an internet protocol address or a virtual host name. Rather, the network identifier of Bhalla is a user identifier for authenticating to a computer system. Therefore, Bhalla nor Hirata teach or suggest using the first virtual host name of the first user with an internet protocol address assigned to the first user to use for network communications of the first user communicated via the first computer, and using the second virtual host name of the second user with an internet protocol address assigned to the second user for network communications of the second user communicated via the first computer.

Because Hirata and Bhalla, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention, Applicants submit independent claims 1 and

16 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-13 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1 as amended. In addition, claims 17, 19-23 and 25-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 16 as amended. Thus, Applicants also submit claims 17, 19-23 and 25-28 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Applicants request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of independent claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-13, 16-17, 19-23 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

II. Dependent Claim Rejections

B. Dependent Claims 6, 9, 14-15, 18, 24 and 29-30 Rejected as Unpatentable over Hirata, Bhalla, Hipp1, Hipp2, Mellquist and Day

Claims 6 and 18 are rejected as unpatentable over Hirata, Bhalla and in further view of the US Patent 7,146,431 Hipp et al. ("Hipp2") under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 14 and 29 are rejected as unpatentable over Hirata, Bhalla and in further view of the US Patent 7,210,147 Hipp et al. ("Hipp1") under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 9 and 24 are rejected as unpatentable over Hirata, Bhalla and in further view of the US Patent 6,115,545 Mellquist et al. ("Mellquist") under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 15 and 30 are rejected as unpatentable over Hirata, Bhalla and in further view of the US Patent 6,728,767 Day et al. ("Day") under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 6 and 18 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claims 1 and 16 as amended, respectively. Claims 14 and 29 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claims 1 and 16 as amended, respectively. Claims 9 and 24 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, as amended. Claims 15 and 30 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claims 1 and 16 as amended, respectively. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Hirata, Bhalla, Hipp1, Hipp2, Mellquist and Day, alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claimed invention, as amended.

Hipp1, Hipp2, Mellquist and Day fail to teach or suggest using the first virtual host name of the first user with an internet protocol address assigned to the first user to use for network communications of the first user communicated via the first computer, and using the second virtual host name of the second user with an internet protocol address assigned to the second user for network communications of the second user communicated via the first computer. Hipp1 and Hipp2 discusses associating an IP address and hostname with a running instance of an application instead of assigning virtual host names to users (see column 2, lines 13-14, Hipp1 and se column 2, lines 7-24 and column 6, lines 5-17, Hipp2). Mellquist merely discusses a name resolution method utilizing a Windows Internet Naming Service and providing a suffix for a host name (see 2, lines 21-24, while Day, in column 4, lines 40-42, Mellquist). Thus Hipp1, Hipp2, Mellquist or Day, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest using a first virtual host name of a first user with an internet protocol address assigned to the first user to use for network communications of the first user communicated via a first computer, and using a second virtual host name of a second user with an internet protocol address assigned to the second user for network communications of the second user communicated via the first computer.

Since Hirata, Bhalla, Hipp1, Hipp2, Mellquist and Day, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claims 1 and 16, as presented above, Hirata, Bhalla, Hipp1, Hipp2, Mellquist and Day, alone or in combination, also fail to detract from the patentability of dependent claims 6, 9, 14-15, 18, 24 and 29-30. Applicants submit dependent claims 6, 9, 14-15, 18, 24 and 29-30 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Applicants request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 6, 9, 14-15, 18, 24 and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: March 7, 2008

/*Christopher J. McKenna/*
Christopher J. McKenna
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000